DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 164 EA 004 708

AUTHOR Hanson, Mark
TITLE The Modern Educational Bureaucracy and the Process of Change.
PUB DATE [72]
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; Administrator Role; Bureaucracy; *Collective Negotiation; Decision Making; *Educational Accountability; *Educational Change; *Power Structure; School Organization; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

The author develops the notion of the modern educational bureaucracy, suggesting that the decisionmaking process of the school is controlled by two authority structures -- the administrators and the subordinates. The intent of this paper is to explore the interaction of these two sources of authority and to analyze the implications for the process of educational change. In addition, the paper examines two potent educational forces that are threatening to disrupt the delicate balance-of-power relationships that now govern the schools. The author argues that the "accountability in the classroom" movement threatens to thrust the administrator into the center of the sphere of influence traditionally maintained by teachers, and that the "collective negotiations" movement is propelling the teachers squarely into the sphere of influence traditionally maintain by administrators. The result will be a new form of educational bureaucracy that will have specific implications for the process of change. The author concludes his paper by hypothesizing on the character of the new educational bureaucracy as it relates to educational change. (Author)

ED 071164

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE MODERN EDUCATIONAL BUREAUCRACY AND THE PROCESS OF CHANGE

MARK HANSON
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION AND ADMINISTRATION
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA

EA 004 708

[1972]

THE MODERN EDUCATIONAL BUREAUCRACY AND THE PROCESS OF CHANGE

A formal organization can be thought of as a social mechanism created to solve, or at least cope with, an on-going problem in society. Like other formal organizations, the school must deal with the tasks of structuring, managing, and giving direction to a complex mix of human and material resources. Unlike most other formal organizations, the school has a human output therefore it is faced with rather unique problems of managerial control.

Questions concerning the effective management of education lead directly to the concept of authority. As Douglas McGregor puts it, "If there is a single assumption which pervades conventional organizational theory, it is that authority is the central, indispensable means of managerial control."[1]

The crux of the problem associated with the concept of authority, therefore managerial control, is found in the form of a fundamental dilemma in education which is linked to the nature of the learning process. On the one hand, the requirements for pupil learning suggest an unencumbered, non-perscriptive environment; and, on the other hand, the requirements for efficiency and predictability in human and material resource management suggest a rational, programmed environment. Put another way, "The one demands personalistic, idiosyncratic and flexible behavior; the other requires impersonal, universalistic and consistent behavior."[2]

Understanding the nature of the dilemma, the question regarding the source of authority begins to come into focus. Charles Bidwell puts the administrative problem in perspective, "... the looseness of system structures and the nature of the teaching task seem to press for a professional

mode of school system organization, while demands for uniformity of product and the long time span over which cohorts of students are trained press for rationalization of activities and thus for a bureaucratic base of organization."[3] Thus, the specter of two very different sources of organizational authority in the school comes into the picture -- one rooted in the classical bureaucratic tradition of formal centralized authority and the other rooted in the informal professionalism of the teacher. The intent of this paper is to explore the interaction of these two sources of authority and to analyze the implications that the interactions have for the process of educational change.

The School as a Traditional Bureaucracy

In attempting to understand the concept of authority as it relates to the formal organization of the school, a review of the classical tradition of organizational theory is essential. Writing in the late 19th Century, Max Weber attempted to elevate the study of organization to a science by developing a theoretical frame of reference for the analysis of authority in formal organizations. Weber defined authority as "the probability that a command with a given specific content will be obeyed by a given group of persons."[4] The question of the source of the legitimization of authority was paramount in his thinking. Weber defined three types of authority, the first legitimated by the sanctity of tradition, as in the divine rule of kings. The second was legitimized by the charismatic character of the leader, such as the man who inspires great loyalty and confidence among his followers. The third type of authority was "legal" authority based on a belief in the supremacy of the

law.[5] In organizations, the constitutional-type charters and formally established policy vest the authority of command in specific organizational offices to be used by the people who occupy those offices. The legitimacy of the controlling influence of the supervisor over the subordinate is, therefore, a matter of organizational law. Anyone who accepts the terms of employment is, in effect, accepting a legal constraint on his behavior and considers it his duty to obey orders.[6]

Efficiency in organization was central to Weber's thinking and central to efficiency was the idea of rationality built into the process of organization. Weber referred to this rational-legalistic organizational type as bureaucratic, hence coining a word which has come to assume almost the opposite meaning today from that intended originally. Weber wrote that the rational-legalistic organization must exhibit the following characteristics:

1. A well-defined hierarchy of authority;
2. A division of labor based on functional specialization;
3. A system of rules covering the rights and duties of employees;
4. A system of procedures dealing with work situations;
5. Impersonality of interpersonal relations;
6. Promotion and selection based on technical competence;
7. Separation of property belonging to the organization and property belonging to the individual.[7]

From these early beginnings a school-of-thought sprang up which is frequently referred to as classical organizational theory. The intellectual disciples contributing to the definition of the rational, efficient organi-

zation were legion and the first half of the 20th Century was awash with principles and practices of "scientific management." Weber's modest list of essentials were expanded rapidly. A few of the organizational characteristics which received general acceptance were:[8]

1. Standardization of role performance.
2. Scientific testing and evaluation of output.
3. Incentives for increased worker motivation.
4. Enforced organizational discipline through reward and punishment.
5. Unity of command.
6. Span of control (the number of workers one supervisor can efficiently control).
7. Adherence to the administrative process (planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating and controlling).

The public educational institution, as well as most other formal organizations, is generally a derivative of classical organizational theory. For example, the school maintains a clear organization hierarchy with the authority and responsibility of command centralized in the office of the principal who reports directly to the superintendent. Educational policy and rules stipulate what is expected and prohibited with respect to the behavior of the teachers and students (the behavior of an administrator is controlled to a much lesser degree). The expressed need for student discipline cannot be forgotten by anyone who has ever been in a public school. A division of labor based on functional specialization is quite apparent at the high school level where we find English teachers, science teachers, home economics teachers, etc.

Also, an apparent need for efficiency in the standardization of the product (in this case the student) is clearly present as the school sends

one cohort of students after another through a lock-step pattern of age-grade educational experiences. The school is designed for all students of a cohort to reach each successive stage (grade) with the same level of knowledge. Unfortunately, the schools have never been able to satisfactorily deal with the issue of what to do with students who arrive at the next higher grade without the requisite knowledge. The classical theorist's treated this issue by stating that the product be rejected and the producer be sanctioned. The school frequently rejects the product, but it has difficulty sanctioning the teachers. Also, the number of students a teacher can effectively teach in a classroom without lowering significantly the quality of instruction is an ever present question in a school (span of control). Rations of 18 to 1 for high schools and 25 to 1 in elementary schools are frequently advocated in educational circles.

In short, the bureaucratic tradition as expressed in classical organization theory has played and does play a major role in the structure and governance of the contemporary school. However, other forces work within the dynamic of the organization which the classical theorists did not recognize. As Peter Blau and Richard Scott point out, "Weber's conceptual scheme, by concentrating on the officially instituted aspects of bureaucracies, neglects the ways in which these are modified by informal patterns and thus excludes from analysis the most dynamic aspects of formal organizations."[9]

In other words, the psychological and sociological variables which influence human behavior were not treated by the classical theorists,

therefore they only paint a partial picture of the authority structure. The next stage of this paper is to discuss the internal governance of the school as it takes into account the interaction of these formal and informal sources of authority.

The School as a Modern Bureaucracy

Authority from Above

The classical theorists believed that a bureaucratic system of organizational control must promote rational, efficient, and disciplined behavior. Through a highly defined organizational hierarchy, a tightly prescribed body of rules, and a well articulated division of labor, the action of subordinates could be strictly limited to those prescribed for maxim efficiency. By not understanding the social and psychological needs that are ever present in the makeup of man, the classical theorists conceptualized a system of management control that was, in reality, repressive and intimidating to subordinates.

In discussing the constraining character of the bureaucratic form on subordinates, Max Abbott describes the system as maintaining rights for superordinates and duties for subordinates. The administrators, he contends, maintain the right to veto or affirm the ideas of subordinates, control their formal communications, initiate their activities, assign duties, confer jurisdictions, settle conflicts, set goals and, by tradition, receive the right to deference. By deference he means, for example, the principal can interrupt at will the teacher's work without feeling the need to apologize, however, the teacher can only interrupt the principal for "good cause." Subordinates thus find their world of work defined in

terms of obligations to their superiors.[10]

Warren Bennis presents a cogentpicture of the intimidating character of the organizational bureaucracy. "At least, very few of us have been indifferent to the fact that the bureaucratic mechanism is a social instrument in the service of repression; that it treats man's ego and social needs as a constant, or as nonexistent or inert; that these confined and constricted needs insinuate themselves into the social processes of organizations in strange, unintended ways; and that those very matters which Weber claimed escaped calculation -- love, power, hate -- not only are calculable and powerful in their effects but must be reckoned with."[11] Indeed, these socio-phychological reactions among subordinates must be reckoned with because they participate in a process which can literally reverse the entire authority system of an organization. The view of an organization which, under given conditions, finds it is being controlled by the subordinates at the lower end of the hierarchy opens up a whole new perspective on authority which plays an important role in the modern educational bureaucracy.

Authority from Below

Stating an obvious truth, "The leader," says George Homans, "cannot bring his group from one state to another unless his orders are, to some extent, obeyed."[12] In the tradition of the classicist, the subordinates would inevitably obey because the system of rules, rewards and punishments permit no other form of behavior. But in the modern bureaucracy a different understanding of the workings of the authority systems of organizations becomes clear.

As early as 1938, Chester Barnard began to argue that the real focus of authority in organizations was at the middle and lower levels of the hierarchy and not at the top as most people assume. He also argued that when the delegation of authority takes place, the authority is delegated from lower levels to higher levels rather than vice versa.[13] Homans speaks of Barnard's thesis:

> If an order given by a leader to a member of his group is accepted by the member and controls his activity in the group, then the order is said to carry authority. This definition implies that the authority of an order always rests on the willingness of the person to whom it is addressed to obey it. Authority, like control, is always a matter of individual decision. This idea runs counter to ordinary forms of speech and legalistic definitions. We speak of leaders as 'the authorities' or as 'persons in authority,' and we say that they can 'delegate authority' to others. That is, we talk as if authority were something inherent in leaders and flowing from them. Our definition reminds us that the power of the leader always depends on his being able, by whatever methods, to carry his group with him; it reminds us of the great commonplace that the government rests on the consent of the governed.[14]

In short, subordinates are obliged to decide, personally or collectively, whether to obey or disobey a directive from superordinates. The act of obedience or disobedience is an act of authority on the part of subordinates. Concurrent with an act of obedience is the delegation of authority upward to the top of the hierarchy with the understanding that the subordinates, on a particular issue, are willing to be governed from above. Barnard suggests four conditions which must be met if subordinates are to accept the authority of a directive from above: (1) he must be able to mentally and physically comply with it; (2) he must understand the directive; (3) he must believe the directive is not inconsistent with the purpose of the

the organization; and (4) he must believe the directive is compatible with his personal interests as a whole.[15]

Within Barnard's context of authority, then, the subordinates of an organization have the authoritative means of supporting or denying the formally established centralized decision-making machinery of the organization. Out of this conceptual perspective a new view on managerial control is formed. This is, an organizational decision-making process which must take into account two authority structures, one in the hands of the superordinates and the other in the hands of the subordinates.

The School as a Balance of Power

The modern bureaucracy concept suggests that the authority structure of the school is best described as a balance of power. On the one hand, the school is an organization whose charters vest in the chief school officer the ultimate formal authority and responsibility of the system; and, on the other hand, the school is an organization which finds informal authority based in the collegial, professional cadre of teachers. An appropriate question at this point concerns the interface of the formal and informal authority structures and how the business of running a school is conducted.

The modern bureaucracy, as it is being defined here, is made up of at least two more-or-less defined spheres of influence in the school. The dimensions of the spheres of influence differ, of course, from school to school; however, their presence can inevitably be found. The spheres of influence are bound by a normative structure and reinforced by patterns of status, power, associations, communication, rewards and sanctions.

Howard Becker in his study of Chicago school teachers provides a vivid picture of the normative expectations that run through the teachers' sphere of influence. Even though the teachers accepted the principal as the supreme authority in the school, they had a clear conception of the conditions under which he could use his authority and toward what ends. When the principal or the teachers sensed that the other was acting without regard to the informal understandings that existed between them, tension or even conflict could result. Becker writes, "Conflict arises when the principal ignores his teachers' need for professional independence and defense against attacks on authority. Both principal and teachers command sanction which may be used to win such a conflict and establish their definition of the situation: i.e., they both have means of controlling each other's behavior."[16]

As the teachers and administrators struggle to control the behavior of the other, the modern bureaucracy stands out in full essence. Each side can rely on an authority base which provides an arsenal of weapons. The principal can, for example, refuse to back up teachers in their confrontation with irate parents, allocate extra after school duties to teachers, assign poor rooms to "trouble-making" teachers, give negative teacher evaluations, and the like.

The teachers can, on the other hand, threaten to resign en masse (therefore embarrassing the principal in public), agitate in the community against the principal, go over the principal's head to the superintendent, or simply ignore the principal and continue doing things their own established way. This last activity is the tactic most frequently used.

Along with the notion that interacting authority systems attempt to

control each other's behavior, the balance of power idea suggests that as innovations are introduced into the school, changes in the role behavior of administrators as well as teachers necessarily must ensue if the innovation is to "take hold." Gross, Giacquinta, and Bernstein report their conclusions on a study which illustrate the difficulties encountered by an educational organization attempting to bring change when working with a philosophy of change which reflects the traditional bureaucratic model rather than the modern bureaucratic model.

The authors report:

> Teachers were asked to conform to a new role model but were not provided with the skills and knowledge they needed. It was assumed by the innovator that any professional teacher 'worth his salt' could read a document describing the innovation and then, on his own, radically change his behavior in ways that were congruent with the new role model. The teachers were exposed to a host of difficulties when they tried to do just that, and these difficulties were not recognized by their superiors or resolved. As noted, teachers tried to behave in accord with the catalytic role model but immediately found themselves exposed to new and unanticipated responses from their pupils. Neither prepared for this new pupil behavior nor equipped to deal with it effectively, they quickly reverted to the security of their previous role behavior.[17]

In their conclusions the authors point out the need for administrators to be cognizant of, as well as give respect to, the sphere of infuence maintained by the teachers. They also stressed the importance of both teachers and managers altering their role behavior to accommodate the arrival of the innovation:

> The school, as an organization, consists of a set of interrelated roles, and because of this, basic changes in the teachers' role performance may require major changes in the management's, if the changes resulting from the implementation of the innovation are to be maintained. At Cambire (where the study took place), for

> example, administrators made all of the major decisions about school policies, programs, and the types and amounts of materials needed in the classroom. However, the nature of the innovation required that many of them be made by teachers. The authority system of the school would require alteration in order to assure that teachers had the right to make such decisions and that management accepted the legitimacy of this change in their role.[18]

The growth and development of the modern bureaucracy as a balance of power has come at considerable cost to the public school middle manager. More than ever he has become the man caught between two colliding systems of control. He faces a superordinate structure (superintendent, school board, state legislature), which expects him to execute the formally established policies of the school. The principal also faces the teachers who are, as Norman Boyan points out, "gaining and exercising the right in determining the rules and regulations which he is expected to administer. He also sees their gaining and exercising the right to monitor and expose his administrative performance while his right to monitor their performance threatens to evaporate."[19]

If one accepts the notion that the managerial control of the school is in fact an exercise of the balance of power, then it is worthwhile to speculate on current educational trends and how they may interfere with this balance in the near future.

The Balance of Power and Educational Change

Accountability and Modern Educational Bureaucracy

The modern educational bureaucracy is being caught up in a current of accelerating contradictory trends which cannot help but have a dramatic effect on the balance of power relationship existing in the school. Two of the contradictory trends which have surfaced in recent years are "accountability in the classroom" and "collective negotiations."

Accountability is defined by Leon Lessinger as the product of a process.

> At its most basic level, it means that an agent, public or private, entering into a contractual agreement to perform a service will be held answerable for performing according to agreed-upon terms, within an established time period, and with a stipulated use of resources and performance standards. This definition of accountability requires that the parties to the contract keep clear and complete records and that this information be available for outside review. It also suggests penalties and rewards; accountability without redress or incentive is mere rhetoric.[20]

California has been one of the first states to enact legislation which is intended to open up the classroom and hold the teacher accountable for the learning, or lack of such, that takes place. On July 20, 1971 the Governor of California signed into law a bill, identified as the Stull Bill, which represents the essence of the accountability movement.[21] This bill is referred to as both a teacher evaluation law and a teacher tenure law. As a teacher evaluation law it sets forth specific requirements for the evaluation of teacher performance and conduct. As a teacher tenure law it prescribes the legal grounds for dismissing a tenured teacher. The bill states that each district school board shall develop and adopt specific evaluation and assessment guidelines which shall include the following:

A. The establishment of standards of expected student progress in each area of study.

B. The assessment of certified personnel competence as it relates to the established standards.

C. The assessment of other duties normally performed by certificated personnel.

D. The establishment of procedures and techniques for ascertaining that the certificated employee is maintaining proper control and is preserving a suitable learning environment.[22]

The heart of the Stull Bill, then, is to measure the progress of students against an established standard and then judge the competence of a

teacher's performancy by how well his students meet that standard.

In short, the accountability movement is, if carried forward vigorously, going to dissolve substantially the teacher's sphere of influence and therefore disrupt the balance of power concept of authority as defined in the modern bureaucracy. By having precise knowledge of classroom goals and objectives, as well as student performance levels, and by having a mandate that teachers must be held accountable to acceptable performance levels, the administrator is finding himself propelled into that educational domain which had previously been (on an informal basis) part of the teacher's sphere of influence. Under the accountability umbrella, then, the role of the administrator becomes one of ensuring quality control in the classroom. The act of ensuring quality control suggests a return to the classical organizational theorist's reliance on formal bureaucratic rules and procedures, use of sanctions, emphasis on organizational discipline, etc., for management control of the educational process.

The Barnard thesis of authoritative control by subordinates must be touched upon as it relates to the trend of accountability. If a school system stipulates that the goals and objectives of the various subject area classrooms must be clearly defined in measurable terms and agreed upon by teachers and administrators (and often parents), and if the performance of students is evaluated against these stipulated goals, then there is little opportunity for the teachers to exercise their informal authority of ignoring the whole thing. Once the protection of tenure has been removed and the classroom activity and output has been thrown open for public inspection and evaluation, much of the informal authority

of teachers will dissipate.

However, the issue is not merely as simple as it has been stated thus far. With the arrival of accountability in the classroom, there will be no easy road to educational change because of the dissolution of the teacher's sphere of influence and the strengthening of the hand of the school administrator. As Ralph Spencer points out, a "consequence of the accountability emphasis is increased conflict due to its headlong clash with other simultaneous movements. Collective bargaining by teachers is the most obvious of these. Teacher performance standards, conditions of employment and management prerogatives are part of negotiated agreements. The pressure for results is seen as the management push for productivity and runs counter to the values generally held by bargaining employee groups."[23]

Collective Negotiations and the Modern Bureaucracy

The decade of the 1960's witnessed an upheaval in all our institutions: political, religious, economic, and social. The educational institution was no exception. "It was then," William Castetter writes, "that the teachers began to organize in protest against employment conditions generated by social unrest. The movement has since led to demands for better salaries, protection against physical assault, economic security, freedom from paternalism, and the right to participate in decisions affecting the conditions under which professional personnel work."[24] By October,1, 1969, twenty-two states had legislation permitting or mandating school boards to bargain with public school teachers.

The collective bargaining process will have significant implications for the modern educational bureaucracy due to its impact on the balance

of power in the schools. Just as the accountability trend is eroding the sphere of influence maintained by the teachers, the collective bargaining trend is eroding the sphere of influence maintained by the administrators. Issues that have always been solely in the domain of the administrators are now often considered legitimate bargaining issues, such as: teacher salaries, teacher-student ratios, out-of-class assignments, free time during the school day, classroom supervision procedures, grievance procedures, vacation schedules, and the like.

As the collective bargaining process makes deeper and deeper inroads into the management of schools, the traditional bureaucratic process of organizational control will more and more be neutralized. As Castetter pointed out, the subordinates will have rights and not just obligations as was the case with the traditional bureaucracy. Also, the organization will be far less intimadating to the ego and creative spirit of subordinates due to the formally established grievance procedures as well as the participation in the decision-making process.

The collective bargaining process incorporated in the management process will have the effect of thrusting the teacher into the sphere of influence which has traditionally been within the domain of the administrator. Chester Nolte identifies some of the differences in management practice which will ensue.

Procedures

	Traditional Approach	Collective Bargaining Approach
1.	One-way communication.	Two-way communication.
2.	Narrow sphere of bargaining, often confined to economic matters only.	Parties may elect to bargain on a broad scale.
3.	Superintendent represented teachers to the board and the board to teachers.	Both parties represented by expert representatives of their own choosing.
4.	Board always has last word.	Impasse procedures provided; neither party can be allowed to paralyze the bargaining process.
5.	Courts finally resolved disputes; losers paid costs.	Third parties called in to intervene in resolution of disputes; costs shared equally.
6.	Good faith not mandated.	Good faith bargaining mandated and assured legislatively and by written agreement.
7.	Written personnel policies sometimes lacking.	Written agreements set terms and conditions of personnel administration.
8.	Divergencies between the policy and practice often went unexplained.	Constant dialogue permits discussion of divergencies between policy and practice.

Power Relationships

9.	Unilateral.	Bilateral.
10.	Paternalistic.	Cooperative sharing of decision-making
11.	Authoritarian.	Democratic.
12.	Management stronger.	Egalitarian.
13.	Board more powerful.	Parties equal in power to require performance from other party.
14.	Counter offer not required.	*Quid pro quo*.
15.	Parties not required to meet.	Confrontation mandated.[25]

The Modern Bureaucracy Updated

In short, it appears to this writer that the colliding trends of accountability and collective bargaining will result in another type of power balance in the schools. This time, however, it will not be made up of formal authority in the hands of administrators and informal authority in the hands of teachers. This time the balance of power will be maintained by formal authority resting in the hands of both administrators and teachers.

The new balance of power arrangements will have significant implications for the process of change. The following hypotheses predict impacts that the updated educational bureaucracy will have on the process of change.

1. Planned Change. Hypothesis: "The more contractually formalized the dual sources of authority become in their relationships, the greater the reliance on the planned change process." The change process will place a great deal more emphasis on planned change, and less on spontaneous, evolutionary type change. The administrators and teachers will be guiding the change process by formal agreement and this process necessarily requires well thoughtout positions on both sides of the bargaining table.
2. District-Wide Change. Hypothesis: "The more contractually formalized the dual sources of authority become in their relationships, the more expansive the bargaining units will become." As a school system adjusts to the formal, planned change process, the school district office, as opposed to the local school unit, will become the bargaining agent for reasons of economy, expertise, and responsibility.

3. Uniform Change. Hypothesis. "The more contractually formalized the dual sources of authority become in their relationships, the more uniform the process of change will become." As the district central office becomes the change broker for the entire administrative system of the district, the character of the change process will be marked by its uniformity. If change is to be a produce of formal negotiation, it is economical and efficient (for both sides) to include in the process as large an organizational unit as possible.
4. Rate of Change. Hypthesis: "The more contractually formalized the dual sources of authority become in their relationships, the slower the rate of change will become." The change process will necessarily become slow and methodical. That is because change oriented agreements will have to be negotiated between the parties involved and precise responsibilities as well as evaluation procedures will have to be defined. Also, agreement on the need for change will have to be established on both sides.
5. Degree of Successful Change. Hypothesis: "The more contractually formalized the dual sources of authority become in their relationships, the more the change initiatives will cohere to the system." Even though the process of change will be slow and methodical, more of the change initiatives will "catch on and hold." The adhesiveness of the change can be attributed to the negotiated agreements which include clearly defined evaluative procedures as well as highly visible output expectations. It will be quite difficult for teachers or administrators to retain their pre-change behaviors simply by ignoring the whole effort.

6. Change Initiated from Outside the System. Hypothesis: "The more contractually formalized the dual sources of authority become in their relationships, the more the change efforts will be initiated from outside the system." Because of the difficulties involved in formally negotiating the change process from inside the system, more and more of the change efforts will be initiated from outside the system. This may come in the way of mandated change from the state legislature, as in the case of the Stull Bill, or from community pressure groups, such as minority groups, or Federal funding agencies.

Summary

To an outsider looking in at the organization and administration of the school, the process of educational change must seem to be a question of direction rather than method. After all, the full weight of managerial control rests with the chief school officer and he is legally empowered to command the obedience of his subordinates. The chief school officer, on the other hand, is usually the first to suggest that the power to command is more often illusion than fact.

A closer analysis of the inner workings of the school reveals a dual system of authority: one rooted in the formal structures of official law and policy and the other rooted in the informal structure of teacher professionalism and colleagueship. Even though informal, the latter is no less real. The modern educational bureaucracy is a creation of the two systems of authority which, through a balance of power relationships, must purposely coincide in their objectives and behaviors or the system will have extreme difficulty in altering consciously its established course. Both the administrative structure and the professional corps of teachers have

the tools and rationale to effectively disable the change efforts of the other when the other attempts to invade a sphere of influence to which access had traditionally been denied.

However, a new stage is now being set which will alter the informal balance of power relationship, and the outcome will result in a significantly different form of educational bureaucracy. The simultaneously erupting pressures for accountability in the classroom and collective bargaining will formally and forcefully alter the existing spheres of influence. The outcome will, the author believes, find the school administrator emeshed in engineering and managing the output of the classroom and the teacher corps will be immersed in contracting the conditions and character of its universe of work.

The implications for the process of change are considerable. To this writer it appears that the change process will be guided by formal, contractual agreement, carried forward in standardized district-wide programs, slow but constant under continuous pressure from systems located outside the boundaries of the school and, perhaps most important of all, the change efforts will "stick" and not erode back to the status quo. Obviously, these latter comments are little better than educated guesses at this point in time, but if the present organizational trends continue at their current rate of speed, the schools might well find themselves in a revised version of the modern bureaucracy.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960, p. 18.

[2]Laurence Iannaccone, "Problems of Financing Inner City Schools," The Ohio State University Research Foundation, August, 1971, p. 14.

[3]Charles E. Bidwell, "The School as a Formal Organization," in James G. March (ed.) Handbook of Organizations, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965, pp. 976-977.

[4]Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, Talcott Parsons (ed.) New York: The Free Press, 1947, p. 152.

[5]Ibid, p. 328.

[6]Nicos P. Morizelis, Organisation and Bureaucracy. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969, pp. 15-16.

[7]Weber, op. cit., pp. 333-334.

[8]Four highly influential thinkers who made major contributions to classical organizational theory are cited with a sample of their work. (a) Frederick W. Taylor, Shop Management. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1911. (b) Henri Fayol, General and Industrial Management. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, 1944. (c) Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick, Papers in the Science of Administration. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.

[9]Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, "The Nature and Types of Formal Organizations" in Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergeovanni (eds.) Organizations and Human Behavior, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969, p. 10.

[10]Max G. Abbott, "Hierarchical Impediments to Innovation in Educational Organizations," Ibid., pp. 42-50.

[11]Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966, p. 7.

[12]George C. Homans, The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1950, p. 417.

[13]Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive. Massachusetts Harvard University Press, 1938, Chapter 12.

[14]Homans, op. cit., pp. 418-419.

[15]Barnard, op. cit., p. 165.

[16]Howard S. Becker, "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.) Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, p. 248.

[17]Neal Gross, Joseph Giacquinta, and Marilyn Bernstein, Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Educational Change. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971, p. 211.

[18]Ibid., p. 214.

[19]Norman J. Boyan, "The Emergent Role of the Teacher in the Authority Structure of the School," in R. Allen and J. Schmid (eds.) Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration. Arkansas: The University of Arkansas Press, 1967, pp. 1-21.

[20]Leon M. Lessinger, "Engineering Accountability for Results in Public Education," in Lesley H. Browder, Jr. (ed.) Emerging Patterns of Administrative Accountability. California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971, p. 398.

[21]The Stull Bill was in reality Assembly Bill 293. Once signed by the governor it was entered into Statutues 1971, Chapter 361.

[22]"Proposed State Board of Education Guidelines for the Development of Uniform Systems of Certificated Personnel Evaluation by Local School Districts-Preliminary Draft." California State Department of Education, 1971, p. 2.

[23]Ralph L. Spencer, "Accountability as Classical Organizational Theory," in Lesley H. Browder, Jr., op. cit., p. 89.

[24]William Castetter, The Personal Function in Educational Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971, p. 328.

[25]Chester Nolte, Status and Scope of Collective Bargaining in Public Education, State-of-the-Knowledge Series, Number Six, the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 1970, pp. 13-14.